

**MINUTES
of the
OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ADVISORY GROUP (OHVAG)
of
ARIZONA STATE PARKS
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 1, 2008
BEN AVERY SHOOTING FACILITY
5000 W. Carefree Hwy, Phoenix, Arizona**

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Rogers called the meeting to order at 1:05pm. Amy Racki called the roll and announced a quorum.

Committee Members Present: Hank Rogers
 Drew John
 Mike Sipes
 Rebecca Antle
 Sandee McCullen

Committee Members Absent: Jim Schreiner
 Pete Pfeifer

Arizona State Parks (ASP) Staff: Dan Shein, Chief of Resource Management
 Amy Racki, OHV Coordinator
 Bob Baldwin, Grants Coordinator
 Troy Waskey, OHV Planner

Other Individuals Present: Suzanne Gilstrap, Arizona Sportsmen for
 Wildlife/Arizona Sportsmen for Wildlife
 Conservation
 Bill Gibson, Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
 Joe Sacco, Arizona Game & Fish Department (AGFD)
 John Savino, OHVAG applicant
 Robert Biegel, OHVAG applicant
 Mike Senn, Assistant Director of Field Operations
 (AGFD)

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

Members, Staff and Guests introduced themselves.

C. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes from the November 2, 2007 Meeting.

Sandee McCullen moved to approve the minutes as presented. Drew John seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

2. Approval of Minutes from the January 11, 2008 Meeting.

Mike Sipes moved to approve the minutes as presented. Rebecca Antle seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

3. Status of FY2007 and FY2008 OHV Recreation Fund Projects.

Troy Waskey began the discussion by noting that there had been considerable action on the projects over the last few months. He led the members through the detailed project information insert in the agenda packet, beginning with the small projects (p33). The total requested funds, if each project were to be approved, would be \$432,000. Interest in the small projects program remains high, with many repeat applicants this year. Project applications have been reviewed for eligibility; some were deemed ineligible. There are several projects in an indeterminate status as to eligibility, and these projects are open for discussion. Amy Racki noted that projects should be determined to be eligible or not eligible; those projects that are currently indeterminate partially meet eligibility requirements. For example: Coconino National Forest (NF) had submitted six small projects; only one can be approved under the small projects rules. Bob Baldwin will be working with Coconino NF to develop a Recreational Trails Program (RTP) grant application for the remaining projects after it is decided which project to approve under the small projects program.

Chair Rogers asked about a project submitted by the Alpine Ranger District, which was deemed eligible but not approved. Troy Waskey said that the project had been approved, but there were no comments in the comments section. Sandee McCullen asked about Project #45, which was deemed ineligible, but approved. Troy Waskey clarified that the project was eligible and approved. Sandee McCullen continued by saying that, with projects requesting fencing/gates, she wants to be certain that the gates are not intended to close routes to OHVs. Because this particular application has not arrived at the BLM's formal Travel Plan yet, there are rumors that the area will be closed to OHVs. Troy Waskey will clarify the intent of the gate.

Sandee McCullen also asked about Project #26, reprinting brochures for Desert Wells. Sandee McCullen felt that this type of project came under the AGFD OHV education dollars and wanted clarification. Troy Waskey said that the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) had submitted nine small project applications at least and several of them are in the same geographic area. That renders the majority of the applications ineligible, so Staff recommends that the ASLD be awarded \$30,000 to carry out several of the projects as they prioritize. This would be a lump-sum award. Joe Sacco addressed the issue of the brochures specifically, saying that the only reason they have not gone forward with reprinting is the amount of revisions needed to the brochure. There is no reason to reprint inaccurate brochures at this point. Troy Waskey said that when the revisions are finalized there could be further discussions with ASLD, AGFD and ASP to

get the brochures reprinted. Sandee McCullen is concerned about accurate information in the brochures.

Chair Rogers asked about Project #8 (the Springerville District) and how the \$8,500 in matching funds is verified. Troy Waskey noted that there are accomplishments reports filed, and invoices of monies expended which will verify the monies and how expended. Matching funds are not a requirement of the small projects program. Chair Rogers asked whether the offered match influenced the approval of this project. Troy Waskey said because the match is not required, that would not influence any decision. Decisions are made according to the rules of the small projects program itself. Troy Waskey also said that this particular match offered is a “soft” match of staff time, rather than money. He will supply Chair Rogers with a copy of the application if necessary. Amy Racki noted that, as part of the agreement, the amount of any match is verified.

Rebecca Antle asked the same question on match regarding the Coronado National Forest (CNF) Projects #16-17. Each of these projects has offered an \$8,000 match, and are noted as needing a ‘volunteer letter’. Rebecca Antle says, in light of the fact that CNF rarely applies for these programs, whether they will receive funding absent the volunteer letter if the letter never materializes. Troy Waskey said that he believes the letter is a requirement and there will be follow up with CNF. She also asked about information on the proposed project areas. Troy Waskey will provide Rebecca Antle with the specific information.

Sandee McCullen asked about a BLM project closing access at the Agua Fria National Monument, Projects #33-34. Troy Waskey noted that both projects are in the same location and those cannot be approved under the rules. The BLM will need to decide which project to complete. Sandee McCullen objects to spending money on any project designed to close OHV routes. Troy Waskey says that he understands the project is in an area designated as closed. Amy Racki clarified the eligible projects rules, which deem the project eligible at this time. Sandee McCullen said that the Agua Fria routes had been a source of contention in the past, and she does not want to use OHV money to close any access. Amy Racki noted OHV Recreation Fund Small Project moneys can be used for OHV mitigation projects. Mike Sipes said that regulating access is one thing, but denying access is another. He feels that the small projects program has been specifically designed to accomplish on-the-ground projects for OHV users. Chair Rogers asked for the status on these projects, whether there were signed agreements. Troy Waskey will follow up with the BLM on Projects #33-34. The agreements for FY2008 have not been signed and finalized. Sandee McCullen suggested informational signs giving the positive reasons for route closures when necessary. She can supply pictures of signs to that effect being used in Colorado currently. She will send them to Amy Racki.

Sandee McCullen asked about Projects #35-36, Black Canyon Quarter; she wants clarification whether that involves the Table Mesa area. Troy Waskey said that for exact locations, he would need to refer to the original application and get back to Sandee McCullen. Sandee McCullen wants to be sure that the maps and guides referenced will be about the motorized portions of the Black Canyon Trail.

OHVAG Minutes
February 1, 2008

Drew John said that the program was designed to get on-the-ground projects done quickly, but that it should be remembered that mitigation is also a responsibility and some decisions are made to that effect.

Chair Rogers noted that he appreciates the information provided, and awaits the follow-up information to be provided by Troy Waskey. He asked when the applicants are notified that they are approved. Amy Racki said that it is hoped that all applicants will be notified this month.

Mike Sipes about the expenditures for last year's small projects. Troy Waskey said that some projects are closed now and the closure paperwork including invoices is now rolling in. Amy Racki said that there are only four currently closed out. The projects were staggered, and some still have 4-5 months before their final completion date. She noted that beginning on page 47 of the agenda packet, there is information on last year's projects. Further information can be provided.

Troy Waskey discussed the OHV Ambassador Program, beginning on page 27 of the agenda packet. He noted that events in December and January have been less numerous but successful. The agreements with National Forest Service have expired but also have been renewed. There is an Ambassador meet-and-greet set for February 9, 2008 at the Middle Gila, and February 16 will be a "Breakfast at the Boulders" event. Other events are scheduled through February and March, leading to the March 7-9 training of the next Ambassador "class". This represents a possibility of another 30 Ambassadors to add to the current 27. He encouraged OHVAG members to attend the training. There are currently 45-50 applicants to be reviewed.

Troy Waskey would like OHVAG to discuss Ambassador policies on page 27. Point number one involves non-Ambassador volunteers. These people have not been through the training but are eager to help. Troy Waskey read aloud (to paraphrase) "The issue of non-Ambassador participation at OHV events is becoming an issue. Current Ambassadors are asking to bring along family and friends. From the agency perspective, these people present a liability risk as they have not been adequately trained or signed on as agency volunteers. Staff recommends that some accommodation be made for these non-volunteers to be able to participate in non-patrol events, but there be a clear demarcation between trained volunteers and untrained volunteers." Troy Waskey is asking how to achieve a balance in this area. Sandee McCullen suggested having the non-Ambassadors sign liability waivers. Troy Waskey also mentioned considering the image the Ambassadors want to project. He also mentioned liability of those who ride "shotgun", such as a child or spouse in a vehicle. Sandee McCullen noted that a well-worded liability waiver would cover any scenario.

Chair Rogers asked Amy Racki whether he could poll the "audience" for response with this question. Bob Biegel, an Ambassador, for some of the events put on by the Ambassadors, he has brought along friends to introduce them to the Ambassador program when they expressed an interest. As for liability, he says that he invites friends as non-

OHVAG Minutes
February 1, 2008

Ambassadors and that his personal vehicle liability should cover any issues that might arise. As for agency liability, he feels that his friends know that they are assuming the risk when they ride along with him. He feels that the Ambassadors themselves have a responsibility to ensure that the people they invite to Ambassador events behave safely and appropriately.

Chair Rogers asked if ASP's Assistant Attorney General had been consulted as far as a waiver. Troy Waskey said that there are typical documents signed at large events by volunteers, which generally covers short-term volunteers, and a slightly different waiver signed by long-term volunteers. Amy Racki said that there is a particular issue of liability regarding the patrols that requires more attention. Troy Waskey will use the insights gained here will be brought back to Health and Safety officers at the BLM and AGFD. Mike Sipes noted that a waiver similar to that used by law enforcement ride-alongs across the country might be appropriate. The ability to recruit new Ambassadors through non-volunteer participation is invaluable. Mike Sipes suggested developing a "dos-and-don'ts" list for non-volunteers to go along with any waiver they may sign, which will help spell out the responsibilities of the non-Ambassador volunteers. Sandee McCullen said language could be added to the waiver that the non-Ambassador acknowledges the rules as well. Troy Waskey noted that the early reaction of the agencies to this issue was to disallow anyone but Ambassadors at any event, however the natural reaction is to include friends and family. A rough draft of a policy is in the works that would be included in the Ambassador's manual. It will include a Code of Conduct statement to be signed by the non-volunteer. This policy document will be available for review at the next Ambassador training. In addition, legal counsel as well as the Health and Safety officers of the various agencies will review the document.

Troy Waskey went on the note page 28 regarding vehicle licensing as it applies to the Ambassadors vehicle. The idea is to have each Ambassador's vehicle street-legal. Should this policy continue, or should volunteers be strictly limited to those areas where street-legal vehicles are not required and be allowed to maintain their current vehicle's status. Mike Sipes said that he would hate to see any volunteer's interest be restricted to a narrow area as an Ambassador. Putting time and effort into training should produce volunteers able to serve in any area or aspect of the program. He says that the street-legal requirement should continue. Chair Rogers said that the Ambassadors should be the example to the OHV community. Mike Sipes also noted the poor example set by Ambassadors with "souped-up" competition motorcycles. Sandee McCullen said that insisting on a street-legal status for some 4-wheel drive vehicles would be automatically excluded from being used by Ambassadors, which eliminates a vast number of potential volunteers. For certain ATVs and 4-wheel drives, there should be some adjustment to the policy.

Amy Racki noted that this is part of a larger issue involving dual-sport motorcycle especially. Many of these riders do not use street-legal tires. Street-legal registration also represents another expense. Troy Waskey said that the biggest concerns are motorcycles and rock-crawlers. The motorcycle volunteers feel they are doing their best with taillights, mirrors, insurance and spark-arresters; other changes to their bikes would be

OHVAG Minutes
February 1, 2008

excessive. Troy Waskey says that the issue of tires should be allowed to slide as long as that rule is not being enforced by law-enforcement. Mike Sipes said that the licensing requirement is another issue that should be enforced by the Ambassadors. Unlicensed vehicles could give the program a “black-eye”. Sandee McCullen said that events and projects could be planned with these requirements in mind to avoid limiting participation. Troy Waskey asked how limiting this requirement would be. Sandee McCullen said that in some OHV communities, at least half the people would be limited. Drew John said that OHVAG should keep in mind the new legislation that will allow more vehicles to become licensed. Troy Waskey said that a policy should be in place before the March 7-9 training. Mike Sipes said he felt that the rock-crawler community especially will likely not turn out for certain events. Further discussion of rock-crawlers followed.

Troy Waskey said that licensing and meeting the street-legal standards has been easy so far. Chair Rogers said that meeting the criteria for becoming street-legal should be a minimum for Ambassadors, especially with things like insurance, lights, horns, etc. He especially feels that insurance is necessary. Sandee McCullen said that most rock-crawler vehicle cannot legally be licensed, due to the smog-creation restrictions. Amy Racki said that she has a potential recommendation since March is very close. That recommendation would be for every vehicle to be street-legal until a final decision is made. Mike Sipes noted that even those who do not have street-legal still have outlets to participate in the Ambassador program as there are several activities that do not require a vehicle. Further discussion followed on the Ambassador activities.

Rebecca Antle asked whether the agency has the final decision as to whether a vehicle is allowable or not. Troy Waskey said that the agencies have specific requirements that must be met by the Ambassadors when they are on the specific agency’s land. Rebecca Antle asked if the agencies could provide a list of areas where rock-crawlers might be allowed to patrol. Troy Waskey said that Amy Racki’s suggestion to take the comments of OHVAG back to the agencies is a good one, and the agencies can provide input on individual vehicle standards.

Troy Waskey also noted that the UTV community has brought up whether they should be required, as Ambassadors, to wear approved helmets. Chair Rogers said that the safety standards should be absolutely maintained. Drew John said that some UTV riders with “cages” are not certified and the helmets will provide more safety than the cage in a roll-over situation. He said that the Ambassadors should set the example for safety in every instance. Further discussion followed regarding UTVs and their build.

Troy Waskey asked whether helmets should be required for any vehicle. Mike Sipes said that the Ambassadors should not have any requirement beyond what’s legally required. Drew John said that the Ambassadors stand for safety and responsibility on every issue. So even though requiring helmets on every vehicle may be excessive, it’s better to take the safe and responsible position. Troy Waskey said that the Ambassador rules at the moment require Department of Transportation (DOT) approved helmets but nothing further, especially in the matter of face shields. He asks whether OHVAG wants to require face shield helmets. Sandee McCullen said that the sport of rock-crawling went

OHVAG Minutes

February 1, 2008

through several iterations of the helmet rules before participants began using the safest helmet. The consensus moved toward requiring full-face helmets for ATVs and other vehicles, and recommendation for full-face helmets for UTVs. A discussion of what's written into the new legislation followed.

OHVAG's consensus was for ADOT-approved helmets, with a recommendation for full-face helmets. Sandee McCullen said that definitions of full roll-cages and so on are available through 4-wheeler competition rules.

Amy Racki said that the dealer packet program has been initiated, and training has been held in Safford at Drew John's dealership. There are also dealerships in Prescott that have joined the program. The program is to provide dealers with customer information on responsible riding. Drew John said that at the APIA meeting he went to, there were complaints that the packets cost \$54 per packet, and he wanted clarification on that fee. Amy Racki said that the ASP packets are free-of-charge. It was clarified that Ride Now would like to create a packet of riding area maps statewide that costs. Sandee McCullen says that Ride Now is planning to fund detailed maps. Amy Racki said that there is no cost to the dealers for the packet materials under this program. She said that the level of information within the dealer's packets will vary from dealer to dealer.

Amy Racki also said that the Natural Resource Conservation District (NRCD) education program is still delayed because the AGFD has put out a bid to do an education program, and ASP would like to coordinate youth education with them. ASP will meet with AGFD to work out coordinating youth education in Arizona. Sandee McCullen asked whether the youth will be restricted to NRCD or will NOHVCC materials be used? Amy Racki has said that so far NOHVCC materials have not been used but they have not been ruled out. Joe Sacco said that books and CDs are available through AGFD. Amy Racki said that AGFD and ASP are working together to also put up the Nature Rules billboards in partnership.

Amy Racki said that there is a national research study going on right now, regarding wildlife and OHV routes. Under the education projects, ASP is considering providing funds for this study. Bill Gibson said that in California there has been some work going on in the Point Reyes area on the effects of OHV recreation and wildlife. The BLM has signed on with that study and expanded it to include Arizona because this subject arises during route designations with some regularity. The study will include areas like the Gila District. The study should take approximately five years, at the estimate of wildlife biologists. AGFD has also signed on to the study. Sandee McCullen asked Bill Gibson about a study carried out in Portland, Oregon not long ago regarding wildlife and OHV routes, and whether this information was being used. Bill Gibson said that as far as he knows that the Portland study information pertains to forest areas mainly, and the study under discussion will pertain to non-forested areas. The study will begin in October in Arizona.

4. Discuss OHVAG's Involvement in 2010 Trails Plan.

Amy Racki said that every five years, ASP is charged with producing a Trails Plan for Arizona. This includes both motorized and non-motorized trails. Planning for the 2010 Trails Plan is underway now. A statewide survey of OHV users and other trails user is due to be drafted in February. There is a timeline for the Trails Plan on page 102 of the agenda packet. If OHVAG would like to provide input on the surveys, pages 103-104 can be completed. These pages represent some of the information sought from the public. There will also be a survey sent to targeted trails users as well. Amy Racki can provide OHVAG members with a draft survey once it's available. The survey will be conducted in partnership with Arizona State University (ASU). There will be focus group components to the research, which will include users at OHV areas and managers of OHV areas. Amy Racki asked if the Trails Plan updates and involvement should become a regular agenda item, or if a select few would like to be updated. Updates could come via eMail. Sandee McCullen asked that everyone look over the information on pages 103-104 to ensure that the questions are well worded. Mike Sipes asked that the last survey be sent as a comparison. The last survey was both difficult to complete and skewed toward non-motorized trails. This survey should be easier and make clear distinctions.

(At this point, OHVAG adjourned for a break. The meeting reconvened at 2:35.)

5. Consider Diversifying Makeup of the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group.

Amy Racki said that there have been requests from environmental, conservation, and sportsmen groups that OHVAG need to consider the diverse nature of OHV stakeholders and develop a balance with environmental, resource management and sportsmen's concerns. This discussion will also include memberships but will not be the focus. The current recommendations made in November will be forwarded to the ASP Board for their next meeting on April 4. OHVAG is also charged with taking a recommendation to the Board on the diversification of OHVAG membership. This recommendation may take effect as soon as January 2009.

Some of the request letters for OHVAG composition change are provided in the agenda packet following page 109. Those letters were from environmental, conservation and sportsman's groups. On page 107, there are points for OHVAG to consider for purposes of this discussion. For practical purposes advisory groups are often odd-numbered. The geographic diversity of OHVAG also should be maintained. OHVAG may want to considering designating members by constituency; for example, one dirt-bike representative, one environmental group representative, and so on. In order to consider environmental concerns for motorized recreation management, what would OHVAG find most necessary, such as a trails engineer, or soil scientist. Would OHVAG consider environmental groups, dealers, and land managers as membership categories? Another consideration would be to phase-in the new structure over, possibly, three years' time. Amy Racki asked that at the end of this discussion, OHVAG provide a motion of recommendation to the ASP Board.

Chair Rogers said that he is a conservationist and environmentalist when it comes to the care of the land. His family has been in Arizona for five generations, and he is passionate

OHVAG Minutes

February 1, 2008

about the country where he rides. Further discussion followed about who is considered an environmentalist within the context of various environment groups.

Mike Sipes noted that some of the strong language in the feedback letters is less than conducive to accepting the feedback and working toward an OHVAG that is responsive to the needs of all OHV stakeholders. He also noted that OHVAG does not direct AGFD as to how that agency's 30% of the OHV dollars received are spent. He says that the more reasonable outlet for sportsmen's concerns would be through AGFD. However, he does not have an objection to having a sportsman representative on the group, though practically each and every current member of OHVAG is also a sportsman.

Drew John noted that OHVAG members serve at the pleasure of the ASP Board, who, he feels, should take the lead in making clear what advice should be coming from OHVAG. Advice on environmental and sportsmen should perhaps come from groups constituted directly to provide that advice. He went on to discuss the problems associated with enlarging the membership of the group. Additionally, adding members while the legislation is pending may bring another set of issues. He also feels that some of the feedback letters advocate "outlawing" OHV uses altogether.

Rebecca Antle noted that most of the grants since 1994 have been for route evaluation, signage, and projects on the ground, rather than environmental mitigation. She feels those responsibilities lie with the land management agencies that apply for grants. Also, she has never in her time on OHVAG seen a sportsman apply to join OHVAG specifically to represent a sportsman's constituency. She doesn't feel that any sportsman applying for a spot would be turned down for membership just because they are a sportsman.

Sandee McCullen said that Drew John's specific point about the ASP Board requirements should be made clear as far as OHV advice. That should be the heart of the group's purpose. She feels that OHVAG members must be knowledgeable and understand promoting responsible OHV recreation at a minimum.

Amy Racki said, to clarify, the ASP Board did not discuss changing the make-up of OHVAG's membership because it was not on their January 18, agenda. Chair Rogers said that a motion regarding members for 2008 has been presented to the ASP Board in the past and resulted in no action on that recommendation. This is what is making the desire of the ASP Board unclear.

Bob Baldwin said that he has not heard the fact raised that the money OHVAG recommends spending is not spent on "pet" OHVAG projects. Some of the funds come from the federal government for specific purposes and with specific requirements, other OHV moneys come from the state, which is almost exclusively spent on federal lands. There are few projects that don't require a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis, which always requires public comment and input. The NEPA determines whatever natural and cultural resource mitigation must take place, if those resources are impacted. Furthermore, any action taken on spending through ASP goes to the ASP Board and is open for public comment as well. OHVAG meetings themselves are open to

OHVAG Minutes
February 1, 2008

the public for comment. Logically, then, there is no segment of the public that can say they have been eliminated from the process. As well, members of sportsmen's groups or environmental groups can request to give a report or open an agenda topic at any time.

Drew John said that he would like to see a motion at the end of this discussion that the ASP Board approve the recommendation already made and then direct OHVAG to investigate the diversity and see what advantages could be had. It is important to follow the processes already established, especially since the legislation provides for more funds. Once the funds materialize, there are more people interested in influencing how the money is spent.

Mike Sipes suggested asking the ASP Board to help define what is expected from the citizen-at-large members. The current language is subject to several interpretations. He also said that while Drew John indicated that he had no problem with non-voting members, he finds that non-voting members do not necessarily add anything to the OHVAG meetings beyond what is available through the Call to the Public segment of the agenda. Non-voting members may also become adversarial, which would also not be of value to the group. Additionally, he feels that having a member of the land management agencies that take advantage of the grants program sit as members would also be an error.

Chair Rogers said that he would like to open the discussion to interested members of the public at this time. Suzanne Gilstrap thanked the OHVAG for the opportunity to speak. She noted that since she participated in the last OHVAG meeting, John Koleszar withdrew his application to OHVAG at the last ASP Board meeting. John Koleszar requested the addition of two non-voting members to OHVAG, one from a recognized sportsman's group and one from an environmental group. The group she represents has not lobbied for this requirement, nor contacted the ASP Board and were therefore surprised that the ASP Board took no action on new members. She feels that the ASP Board is sending a message as a whole that they feel strongly about the feedback already written indicates a sensitivity on the ASP Board's part that adding some diversity to OHVAG would be positive. The groups Suzanne Gilstrap represents have made a recommendation for two non-voting members to be added to OHVAG, which they will continue to recommend. There are groups in contact with her that feel adding voting members is a possibility. She feels that adding non-voting members that will receive all the information OHVAG receives now, and that will add to the comfort level of what OHVAG actually does. She has noted that OHVAG does deal with environmental mitigation from OHV use, which is fine. She says that OHVAG is only, however, able to respond to applications for assistance in these areas and cannot initiate projects on their own. Her constituent groups, however are going to continue to ask for two non-voting members, and that it would be advantageous for OHVAG to take action before action is imposed on it from the ASP Board.

Amy Racki said that one thing mentioned at the last ASP Board meeting was that one of the members of the ASP Board stated they did not encourage adding non-voting members because they feel those are "second-class citizens".

OHVAG Minutes
February 1, 2008

Sandee McCullen noted that she feels that non-voting members will add a level of contention to meetings that will be of no value. She asked whether OHVAG might consider encouraging sportsmen and environmentalists to attend meetings and speak during the Call to the Public agenda segment. This would allow for a stepped approach to incorporate those views. There does exist a “wall” between OHV users and environmental groups and others, and the way to work through the wall is to encourage participation and not demand participation.

Suzanne Gilstrap said that the sportsmen would be able to work with the OHVAG regardless of the direction. She does say that a lot of effort has been taken to get sportsmen to the table to discuss the legislation, and they all understand the importance thereof, as well as the challenges to OHV without having participated so far. She says that adding two non-voting members is a small request in the overall view, considering that the previous desire was to add voting members. For OHVAG to reject this recommendation, from her perspective, would not be advantageous to OHVAG.

Mike Sipes says that during the six years he’s been a member of OHVAG, he cannot remember a time when a member of the public requested time to address the group. The meeting times and dates are always available to the public should they want to appreciate. He also noted that as a graduate wildlife biologist, he has been able to bring that knowledge to his decisions on OHVAG. He feels that there isn’t one member of OHVAG that would be a member of OHVAG if there was not concern for the environment on their part.

Bob Beigel said that some points made by OHVAG have been well made regarding the non-participation of the public at OHVAG meetings. Other groups could arrive at the good understanding of OHVAG by attending meetings with full attention. He notes that non-voting members may be relatively costly for the value of their membership.

Drew John asked Suzanne Gilstrap about a phone call from an individual who said that the environmental groups will be withdrawing their goal of having an environmentalist appointed to OHVAG. Suzanne Gilstrap responded that she is not familiar with that position, but that her constituents are not “pushing” for a voting member on the group. Chair Rogers said that Representative Weiers had called both sportsmen’s groups and environmental groups soliciting their support for the OHV legislation, and once the legislation has passed, that would be the time to work toward “fixing” OHVAG.

Sandee McCullen said that there is concern about the passing of the legislation. There is no problem with interacting with sportsmen or hearing their concerns. She also noted that some environmental groups have a lesser understanding of OHV recreation, which has maintained that “wall”. The format of the Call to the Public agenda segment does not allow for response or discussion to anything brought up then. However, adding a particular group as a source of reports added to the meeting agenda does allow for discussion of points brought up. This is currently how information from the BLM, AGFD and the USFS is brought to OHVAG. Suzanne Gilstrap said that her constituents will stand by their recommendation of adding two non-voting members to OHVAG. This

OHVAG Minutes

February 1, 2008

would help ensure that all stakeholders have a place at the table, so to speak. She feels that the ASP Board has rejected the current OHVAG nomination because they also feel changes must be made.

Rebecca Antle asked Suzanne Gilstrap whether this change could be further discussed following the passage of the OHV legislation, because everyone has worked so hard to see the legislation enacted.

Chair Rogers noted that he sees room for a sportsman on OHVAG because of the “blame” being placed on ATV groups for damage caused by hunters on ATV in search of game. This is especially true of elk and deer horn hunters. He proposes a change to the citizen-at-large language to specify a sportsman-at-large, so that those voices would be added and everyone could work together toward responsible OHV recreation.

Drew John noted that he has mixed feelings about both adding non-voting members and adding standing reports from sportsmen and environmentalists. He does feel that for 2008, there should be a standing agenda topic for presentations from those groups rather than reports at regular intervals. This would allow OHVAG to complete 2008 and arrive at a more well-considered decision about the diversity of OHVAG.

Mike Senn, Assistant Director of AGFD wanted to thank the OHVAG for taking the discussion under advisement. Diversity is an issue that raises itself frequently. He says that AGFD observed during discussions of the legislation that there are many stakeholders in the OHV issue that are not familiar with each other. He says there is always a benefit in engaging those groups with differing viewpoints. John Savino noted that he looks forward to having a sportsman on the group, and also said that there is a time-table for new members and recruitment and wonders if that would changed.

Drew John noted that the legislation could possibly have disappeared without the work of sportsmen in the legislature. The sportsmen and AGFD “picked up the ball” and got a new sponsor for the legislation.

Sandee McCullen said that at the first meeting on OHV legislation some sportsmen had advocated a \$500/vehicle fee, which shows how long a way has been covered since those discussions. Chair Rogers agreed that working with the various stakeholders has helped expand his knowledge of those stakeholders. Suzanne Gilstrap said that she has appreciated the opportunity to participate in this process, and will continue to work with this group.

Chair Rogers called for the motion. Mike Sipes moved that OHVAG ask Staff to take to the Arizona State Parks Board the recommendation that the three previously nominated applicants be ratified at the next Arizona State Parks Board meeting, and also communicate OHVAG’s appreciation of the diversity existing on OHVAG to the Arizona State Parks Board and ask that the Arizona State Parks Board consider revising the criteria for the OHVAG citizen-at-large members to reflect that a sportsman serve in that capacity. Drew John seconded the motion. The motion was reiterated for the record, and

is accurately reflected above. Sandee McCullen asked whether Mike Sipes wanted to specify a sportsman, to which Mike Sipes responded that the specifying a sportsman will maintain diversity. The motion was amended to say: "OHVAG asks Staff to take to the Arizona State Parks Board the recommendation that the three previously nominated applicants be ratified at the next Arizona State Parks Board meeting, and also to communicate OHVAG's appreciation of the diversity necessary on OHVAG to the Arizona State Parks Board and ask that the Arizona State Parks Board consider revising the criteria for an OHVAG citizen-at-large member to reflect that a member of a recognized sportsman's group serve in that capacity." Drew John upheld his second of the amended motion.

Troy Waskey asked for clarification on the motion, whether leaving the group at five members to represent unassigned OHV constituents. Mike Sipes agrees that that provision of the makeup of OHVAG be left as is. He feels that narrowing all the criteria could cause difficulty in recruiting new members. Sandee McCullen noted that she felt the current by-laws express diversity as they stand. Chair Rogers called for the vote. The motion carried with no further discussion. This item is referred to the ASP Board for further action.

Drew John noted that the ASP Board had asked for a presentation from OHVAG or possibly Staff on some aspect of OHVAG's processes and procedures, especially with regards to member recruitment and diversity. Amy Racki said that she could request an agenda item to present this information. Drew John asked that Staff put together a presentation on what OHVAG's understand their duties and mission in the past and for the future, to bring them better understanding of what OHVAG does and their position relative to the ASP Board. That way, if the ASP Board desired further changes to OHVAG, they will be able to make the proper requests. Amy Racki will clarify what the ASP Board needs as far as information.

Bob Baldwin said that Drew John had presented to the ASP Board last year about OHVAG and it's work. He suggested that a "state of the group" item be scheduled with the ASP Board on a regular basis. Amy Racki said that OHVAG can present their viewpoints to ASP Board rather than having Staff present both the OHVAG view and the Staff view. Drew John and Chair Rogers will work together on that presentation. The next ASP Board meeting will be April 4 at Lake Havasu City. The next OHVAG meeting is May 2 in Phoenix.

6. Discuss OHV Legislation.

Chair Rogers asked Amy Racki whether OHVAG could send a letter of support for the legislation if they so choose. Amy Racki said that that such a request must be forwarded to the ASP Board or Executive Staff. She noted that the individual members of OHVAG can send members under their own names. Rebecca Antle asked when the letters are needed; Chair Rogers said they are needed as soon as possible.

Rebecca Antle asked about the provisions of the legislation regarding ASLD. She hears that ASLD gets money from the bill regardless of whether OHV recreation is permitted

OHVAG Minutes
February 1, 2008

on their land or not. She says that she feels funds will be cut off from ASLD if OHV use is prohibited, and would like some clarification. Mike Senn says that in his discussions with ASLD, they have said they cannot put specific provisions in the bill because the land is held in trust for the state of Arizona. They cannot do anything in conflict with their own mandated mission. Chair Rogers asked whether it was clear whether OHV users with a sticker would be allowed access to ASLD land, and Mike Senn says that will be the case. This will go a long way toward "sticker reciprocity" with other states. Further discussion on ASLD followed.

Drew John said that a recent article in the Arizona Republic contained a few errors, especially on what constitutes being street-legal. They missed the rearview mirror requirement. One comment recommended that no unimproved routes be used unless they are specifically marked for OHV use. He feels that this is not completely logical. Bob Baldwin said that the Travel Management Plan on federal lands is exactly what will designate routes for OHV use. Drew John said that unimproved roads in the Counties may be removed from use without this designation. Mike Sipes finds that the language is too restrictive by specifying "OHV use" rather than vehicle use at large. Chair Rogers read the provision verbatim that clarified that routes will be available by whatever rules are made by federal, state or local entities.

Drew John also noted that the article discussed Senator Gould's non-support of the bill because the fees amount to a tax and that the agencies benefiting will not use the funds properly, and that there is no enforcement mechanism in place. Drew John took exception to this stance, as the legislation provides for enforcement. He notes the current prevalence of unfunded mandates from the state to the counties. The legislation adds several new officers at AGFD to enforce OHV rules. He also noted that the legislation will lower the cost of registering an OHV, so the savings will be considerable. In the end, OHV users will be charged less money.

Amy Racki asked about the recommendation in the legislation on page 119, line 21-27 as to the funds generated by the sale of the indicia and what ASP will be allowed to do with those funds. She is asking for OHVAG's interpretation, especially about routes and trails and their physical management, and also land acquisition. She asks whether OHV facilities such as restrooms could be funded. Mike Sipes says that the ASP Board will likely interpret the policy based on the legislation and define what the funds can be used for. The ASP Board may not choose to get involved in managing OHV recreation facilities. He anticipated that the ASP Board will develop criteria to define ASP's role. Mike Sipes feels that this may allow ASP to develop some OHV areas within State Parks to allow for a possible income stream, which has been discussed in the past. Sandee McCullen asked whether individual letters should be sent now. Chair Rogers said that Representative Weiers has requested group letters of support for the legislation. Any of those letters should be sent as soon possible to Representative Weiers.

D. PRESENTATIONS

None.

E. REPORTS

1. Chair's Report

No report.

2. Staff Reports

a) Update on ASP Board Actions

This topic has been discussed fully in item C5 above.

b) Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)

Amy Racki reported that the SCORP was completed for this five-year cycle. The section on OHV recreation was updated and expanded. The SCORP text is available on the Parks website, in CD, or in hardcopy. Amy Racki will provide copies to OHVAG.

c) New Travel Policies/Human Resource

Amy Racki provided each OHVAG member a packet of information regarding the new State Policies on travel reimbursement for volunteers and state employees. She asked that the members complete the HR forms and submit them to Vicki Trevino of HR. Travel claims will now be paid through the payroll system, at the same time as the payroll calendar. (A payroll calendar was supplied with the packet of information.) There is also a revised travel claim form to be completed. Instructions for the form were provided, as well as an FAQ. The process is still relatively simple. A list of allowable maximums for lodging and meals was also supplied. Receipts for lodging and meals are still required from volunteers. Advisory Committee Coordinator Ruth Shulman is available to answer questions. Dan Shein also noted that the maximum allowable amounts for meals should be listed.

Amy Racki also clarified that expenses for attending the ASP Board meeting should be claimed on the new travel claim form as long as an OHVAG discussion was on the Board agenda.

d) Update on Mototrax RTP grant and project

Bob Baldwin presented the information that the status of this grant/project from the 2004 RTP funds and required a 20% match is that the Mototrax people found a different piece of land to acquire, which requires a NEPA study. The NEPA study was to be completed by volunteers, members of the Army Corps of Engineers, AGFD, and ASU. The grant states that acquisition needs to take place within 18 months of the grant agreement. A six month extension was agreed to, which has also passed. Bob Baldwin received a cultural assessment at the end of the six-month period, which was sent to the State Historic Preservation Office for review. This assessment turned out to be

inadequate, and there were no other NEPA documents submitted. Two years into the project, the NEPA remains incomplete. Bob Baldwin has communicated with Mototrax that because the project remains incomplete, terminating the grant is under consideration. The ASP Board has asked that there be no endless extensions of any incomplete projects. Mototrax has indicated that they will withdraw the grants, though official notice has not yet been received. This will add \$400,000 back into the 2004 RTP funds and will require a 20% match though current projects require a 10% match. There may be some issues reallocating the funds because of this. A recommendation to reallocate the distribution of 2003-2004 funds will be brought up at the joint OHVAG-ASCOT meeting to allow for trails maintenance projects. Mike Sipes said that the RTP program and the Transportation Enhancement Funds comes from basically the same "pot" of money. Since a new rails-to-trails project was funded with Transportation Enhancement, motorized trails are specifically prohibited, however monies can be transferred between RTP and Transportation Enhancement. This will allow for motorized projects funding. Amy Racki asked about the rails-to-trails project. Mike Sipes said that that project was funded through Transportation Enhancement from the same TEA-21 Act that funds the RTP program. Funds are transferable at will according to the legislation. Bob Baldwin said that transfer may only be possible before funds are obligated or before a project is completed. The 2003-2004 funds are still available and have not expired, but should be used sooner rather than later. Further discussion will be held at the May 2, 2008 joint meeting. Sandee McCullen noted that the Mototrax Park is almost completed and will be holding a grand opening soon. Funds for completion have likely been provided by the City of Gila Bend, according to Sandee McCullen.

F. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Joe Sacco noted that when the meeting adjourns a tour of the new AGFD facility will be available. He also said that the AGFD leadership is committed to fostering the relationship between OHVAG and the AGFD.

G. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE, REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

Amy Racki said that ASP has a booth at the Super Bowl and encourages people to visit the booth if they are attending the game. She also thanked Sandee McCullen, Mike Sipes and Rebecca Antle for continuing to serve on OHVAG and provided them with a Certificate of Appreciation. Rebecca Antle suggested that if the OHV Legislation passes, Amy Racki contact California to get some information on administering their sticker system.

H. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 2, 2008, which is the joint meeting with ASCOT in Phoenix; August 8 in Payson; and November 7-8 for the annual field trip and meeting, at a location to be determined. The next ASP Board meeting will be April 4, 2008 at 10:00am in Lake Havasu.

I. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Rogers asked for a motion to adjourn Mike Sipes moved to adjourn. Drew John seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion. The meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.